

Concepts of Caste and Race in Colonial Ethnography: Some Reflections on the Census Reports (1881-1931)¹

Sabya Sachi R. Mishra

*Department of Humanities & Social Sciences, Indian School of Mines; Dhanbad 826 004, Bihar, India
email: sabyasachimishra@hotmail.com*

KEY WORDS Brahmin; Kshatriya; Vaihya; Shudra;
Arya-Samajists; Brahmo-Samajists.

ABSTRACT The colonial notions of Indian caste and race is a widely studied area. However these issues have attracted a fresh attention recently where the ideas of caste and race are being analyzed in terms of its relationship with colonial power and the way those redefined person, community and identity. There follow two broader yet distinct kind of arguments in this context: one in which "race" and "caste" are seen as tools for stereotyping the subject society by the colonial officials. This it is argued was done even at the cost of "fabricating" and "inventing" certain identities. This also led to rigidification of the caste structure. In a way, these writings see a monolithic structure of the colonial discourses on caste and race, which was used for reinforcing the colonial power-relation. And, the other, in which the debates on caste and race during colonial rule are emphasized as being a part of the wider contemporary European debates about the civilizations and their progress. This School implicitly denies any element of colonial power interest in these debates, and strongly argues for the scientificity of the debates. It recognizes the shifts within the colonial discourses. Through a study of the census reports carried during colonial rule, I read the concepts of caste and race as they appeared in the classificatory scheme of these reports. A range of conflicting ideas emerge through the discussions which often contesting the previous theories make an attempt to incorporate the subtle nuances of the subject society. Several writers have also missed on the centrality of traditional textual ideas in these discourses. Contesting which only newer theories could emerge. Very often caste emerged as a dynamic institution and not static as many have argued. Moreover, I emphasize the utilitarian value of science in these discourses. The coloniality of the discourses on "caste" and "race" lay in the significance of science as a "means" for enforcing colonial power-relation rather than confining it to a pure "end" in itself.

"On a stone panel forming part of one of the grandest Buddhist monuments in India, the great tope of Sanchi, a carving in low relief depicts a strange religious ceremony. Under trees with conventional foliage and fruits, three women attired in tight clothing without skirt, kneel in prayer before a small shrine or alter. In the foreground the leader of a procession of

monkeys bears in both hands a bowl of liquids and stoops to offer it at the shrine. His solemn countenance and the grotesquely adoring gestures of his comrades seem intended to express reverence, devotion and humility. In the background four stately figures - two men and two women of tall stature and regular features clothed in the flowing robes and wearing elaborate turbans, look on with folded hands in apparent approval of this remarkable act of worship. Antiquarians' speculation has for the most part passed the panel by unnoticed, or has sought to associate it with some pious legend of the life of the Buddha. A larger interest however attaches to the scene, if it is regarded as the sculptured expression of the race sentiment of the Aryans towards the Dravidians which runs the whole course of Indian tradition and survives in scarcely abated strength to the present day ... It shows up the higher race at the friendly terms with the lower, but keenly conscious of the essential difference of the type ..."²

This picturesque illustration of the sculpture by Risley - commissioner of the 1901 census - and his explanatory justification for the "racial sentiment" of the Indians which he claims has had a changeless lineage from past to the present, is but one example of the variety of colonial discourses that attempted to understand the institution of Indian caste and its relation with "race". Right from the days of Orientalists like William Jones to the first half of the twentieth century, significant part of the colonizers' mind was engaged with knowing the complexities of the subject society. And the realm of caste and "race" in India put forward a puzzling challenge to them. A systematic understanding of the Indian caste formed a significant part of the colonial official enterprise. While initially the

officials had to rely on the information of the translators and other native informers for classifying and categorizing the castes and tribes of India, what marked out the late 19th century colonial discourses on the Indian castes and races was: the need for a uniform understanding of the caste necessitated by the consolidation of the British empire, and introduction of the constitutional politics; and second, the emergence of the new "scientific" theories which were now being applied in understanding the phenomenon of caste. As Susan Bayly while explaining the necessity of the uniform and scientific understanding of caste in India by the colonizers has written, that, "the thrust on the systematic and 'scientific' understanding was to subjugate it; to name it, class and number its castes and by implication the races, was to fragment a complex and dynamic society and to draw strategic gains from its atomized constituent elements - recruiting the martial races, pacifying 'criminal tribes', dividing Brahmins from 'non-Brahmins' in the new arena of the constitutional politics ..."³

This paper while attempting to understand colonial discourses around the caste and "race" in India by focusing at the census reports carried between the 1881-1931 tries to develop two broader themes: one, it looks at the broader shifts that came in the "scientific" perception of the colonial understanding of the Indian caste and race; and second, it attempts to see as to how the "scientific" explanations of the colonial officials and theorists despite having a bearing of the current continental theories became a tool for reinforcing the relationship of domination and subordination between the colonizers and the colonized. A subject of such complexity calls for incorporating the wider discussions on the continental theories of the time and the alternative indigenous theories that contested them. However refraining from a discussion on these issues, this paper intends to raise some of the general points about the broader historical debates that are now being carried around the questions of person, identity, community and their relation with colonial power.

I

In the recent writings on the colonial per-

ception of caste and "race" in India one could broadly see two distinct kinds of arguments being put forward. The authors like Nicholas Dirks⁴, Ashish Nandy⁵, Ronald Inden⁶, etc. explain the Britishers' perception of the Indian caste as a mere "invention" and part of the larger project of the western "essentializing" of India. Quite away from looking at the Indian castes as a primordial fact, these authors argue, the colonial theorists formed an essentially flawed idea of the Indian castes. The Indian caste to the British officials appeared as an all pervading aspect and essence of the Indian social order, which was the manifestation of a civilization at the lower scale of development, was "child-like", passive and consisting of hierarchical "caste society". This kind of an understanding, the writers argue, helped the colonial stereotyping of the Indian society and dichotomizing it as barbaric against the "civilized" Europeans. These writings though emphasize on the instrumentality of these kind of stereotyping as one ploy to enforce the colonial power relation through the use of categories like superior-inferior, barbaric-civilized, etc. yet they fail in to see the variety of contesting shifts in the colonial discourses. They tend to look at the colonial discourse as a monolithic structure, as if there were no internal conflicts in it. As it would follow in this paper, quite contrary to the understanding of these writers, closer reading of the census reports and literature of the colonial ethnographers brings to fore a wider variety of contestations, and differing opinions about the origin, nature, and structure of caste in the Indian society. More importantly, these writers fail to see the centrality of the traditional Brahminical texts, in an otherwise colonial "imagination" of the Indian castes and races. In the process of recording what was observed, the colonial theorists did not always exercise their own options. The texts like Manusmriti formed a central reference point for, against or going beyond which the theorists expounded their ideas. Of course newer identities began to emerge as the result of these interpretations, yet the "fabrication" of the caste identities had severe limitations as they could emerge only after the interface with the traditional identities.

An entirely different set of arguments have

been provided by the historians like Susan Bayly⁷ and others who while critiquing the "essentializations" by the colonial theorists, and their perceptions of colonial societies as "other", argue that away from having interest in the colonizing the subject society, these theorists were much more interested in placing themselves in the peer group of the contemporary European scholars, and participate in the larger European debates about the civilizations. As Bayly argues, "in speculating about what they understood as the 'castes', 'races' or 'nations' of the subcontinent, the scholar-officials were trying to place themselves in the vanguard of the contemporary scientific thought. India for them was not a self-contained ethnographically separate 'other', and certainly did not constitute a domain of purely localized, imperial or strategic significance."⁸ According to Bayly, in their attempt to place India ethnologically within the larger debates of civilization current at that time the scholar-officials were primarily concerned about the "racial" constitution of India, and the question of castes at best served as a "subsidiary" element in their studies. She argues, "far from representing a monolithic consensus on 'caste', the most significant approach to India as an ethnographic problem was the theme of race, with its accompanying and to us abhorrent notions of evolutionary racial hierarchies and historic race conquests, its belief that civilization was unique achievement of ethnologically 'advanced' races, and its insistence of eternal deep-seated antipathy between so called higher peoples and those of inferior or debased or degenerate 'blood'. It may come as a shock to find that writers who are thought of now as compilers of caste data often treated the values and ideologies of 'caste' as subsidiary issue, of significance only to some of the Indians they were describing and classifying. These analysts were much more concerned with a wider body of speculative scholarship in which the biological and moral qualities of 'race' were perceived as universal human endowments."⁹

Bayly recognizes the plurality of colonial discourses, however by implicitly denying "otherness" of India within a specific colonial relationship, she denies the coloniality of these discourses. She tends to celebrate their

"scientificity", and fails in to see that scientificity of colonial discourses was not always in contravention to the relationship that the colonial state attempted to establish between the rulers and the ruled. Almost all the colonial writings of the period though representing a variety of approaches towards understanding the castes and races of India invariably portrayed the subject society as inferior or at a lower stage of civilization. As the editor of William Crooke's "Races of Northern India" while writing its preface would demonstrably write about the book that "it intended to supply in handy and readable form those who wish to learn something of the life of uncivilized races of our empire; it will serve the purpose equally of those who remain at home and of those who fare forth into the world and come into personal contact with peoples in the lower stages of civilization."¹⁰ Even Risley whose introduction of anthropometry in understanding the Indian ethnography marked him out, after long and descriptive analyses of the correspondence between race and caste in India, would not fall short of making prescriptive analysis of the possibilities of emergence of a nation in the Indian society. As he wrote, "the standard elements of nationality in India either do not exist or make for diversity rather than uniformity. The factors of nationality in India are two - the common use of English language for certain purposes and the common employment of Indians in the English administration. At present these factors affect only a limited group of persons among whom the Muhammadans have hitherto stood rather aloof. The masses have not been affected at all. They can not be reached through language but they might be reached through the agency of self-governing institutions (The institutions being village councils). In this direction, and I believe in this direction alone, is it possible to advance towards real political representation. Progress in any case will be slow, but nothing will retard it more certainly than the impatient idealism which insists upon beginning at the wrong end."¹¹ These statements become significant in an era of nationalist upsurge when the very justification of a colonial state in India was being strongly questioned by the nationalist leaders. They are also instructive of the way scientific knowledge was used as an instrument by the British scholar-officials in

reinforcing the colonial interest. Susan Bayly fails to locate this kind of instrumentality of science during the colonial period.

II

Systematizing the Knowledge: The Census Reports

The need for a census in India was a long felt one for the colonial officials. However a proper attempt towards it could only begin in 1865. Rather regional in character, the census reports of 1865 and 1872 were largely based on the Brahminical theory of castes with the population being divided in the four-fold verna order. Although this classificatory scheme met with the approval of the Sanskrit scholars and those well versed in the Vedic myth, the simple four-fold verna categorization neither corresponded to the relationship that existed in practice between the castes nor served any particularly useful administrative purpose. The lacunae in these census reports necessitated the consideration for a general Census of India by minimizing the caste tabulation, which as an officer reported, "present so many difficulties, involves so much labour, and at the same time is so unsatisfactory when completed, as the working up of the caste tables."¹² Responding to these problems the Secretary of State for India wrote to the Governor-General in India arguing about caste being, "essentially a tribal and not a religious distinction" and ordered that, "whatever instructions on this subject are given, they should be based on uniform principle and that the separate local details should all be susceptible of being brought under a final uniform classification."¹³ As a result of these orders in the census of 1881, caste became a subset of religion, particularly Hindu, and for other religions the preferred term was sect. The appendix of the census included a column, "caste if Hindu, sect if other religion."

The census of 1891 made an important departure by moving towards a more systematic and uniform principle of classification. The 1891 census was primarily based on occupational criteria, the materialist evolutionary basis for this classification having been first laid down by J.C. Nesfield in a study of the castes of North India and by Denzil Ibbeston in his introduction to the 1881 census of the Punjab. In this census

perhaps for the first time all the available theories about the caste were subjected to a critical scrutiny. The racial as well as the functional explanations of the caste were juxtaposed, and the idea of caste being, "a peculiar attribute of the Brahminical form of religion" were outrightly rejected. As the report read, "granting that there is something inherent, as it were in the conditions of life in India that fosters the sentiment of caste system is an expression and granting again that the form, or the collection of forms that this expression has taken is the outgrowth of the Brahminic creed, it seems within the bounds of reasonable hypothesis to attribute to its present development an origin distinctly racial."¹⁴ This racial explanation of caste in the census was seen as complementary to the Rig Veda's depiction of the famous war between the Aryans and dasyus. The war was seen as "war between Aryan race with indigenous darker race". According to the census, the idea of racial qualification of caste got exemplified in the castes of Bengal where, "it may be inferred that the population consists of a mixture of two breeds, first, the western in which Aryan is an element especially in Bihar, but mixed with dark races of the hill tracks. Secondly, the eastern, where the predominant factor is the Mongoloids of the North-East, mixed with the dark races of the plane, and marshes and with a slight tincture of Aryan blood in a portion of the upper class."¹⁵

The census of 1891 created a complex fusion between the racial as well as functional explanations of caste. The report argued, "inside the community of the Aryans themselves, assuming that the fulmination of the Brahmins had any effect, the development of function must have preceded the caste line. That is the right of sacrifice, and to perform the other offices of the priesthood having been established on a hereditary basis, the natural tendency would be to extend the principle to those who supported the priesthood, namely the warrior chiefs. So, too, within the circle of Vaishya or colonists of Aryan descent, function became hereditary through trade guilds in imitation of the higher classes and with the growth of the settlements of the race..."¹⁶

Ibbetson in his census report of the Punjab¹⁷ summarized the popular and currently received theory of caste in the following manner: (1) that

caste is an institution of the Hindu religion and wholly peculiar to that religion alone; (2) that it consists primarily of four-fold classification of people in general under the heads of Brahmin, Kshtriya, Vaishya and Shudra; and (3) that caste is perpetual and immutable, and has been transmitted from generation to generation throughout the ages of Hindu history and myth without the possibility of change. To each of these points Ibbeston believed there to be a convincing reply. Firstly, he argued, caste was more of a social than a religious institution, and conversion from Hinduism to Islam did not necessarily have the slightest effect upon caste. Secondly, he pointed out, there were Brahmins looked upon as outcastes by those who under the fourfold classification would be classed as Shudras; there were no such thing as Vaishya, and it was very doubtful that there was such a thing as Kashtriya; and Shudra had no present significance save as a convenient term of abuse to apply to someone considered lower than oneself.

Ibbeston went on to assert that castes were essentially guilds, and that guild in its earliest form was nothing less than a tribe based on common descent. Great many caste divisions or sub-caste units, such as gotras, were essentially tribal in origin. A fusion of all these ideas one can apparently see in the schema of 1891 which though primarily following the line of occupational basis of caste, towards the end of the table of the census enumerated a set of groups, viz. Muslim foreign races, Indefinite Indian castes, native Christians in which race was taken as a dominant feature.¹⁸

Following Risley's application of anthropometric tools in classifying the census data, the census of 1901, with Risley as its Chief Census Commissioner had a different set of rules altogether. Risley before becoming the Chief Census Commissioner had already worked in Bengal where he had gained certain clear ideas about anthropometry. As Crispin Bates writes, "in the process of measurement of skin colour, skull size, orbito-nasal indices and overall stature, Risley's previous studies had given him a clear idea as to where his results would lead, and he had no difficulty in fitting the fewest observations into a complex typology of racial types."¹⁹

Risley explained the origin of castes in

racial terms. He wrote, "race sentiment rests upon a foundation of facts which scientific methods confirm; that it supplied the motive principle of caste; that it continues in the form of fiction or tradition, to shape the most modern developments of the system; and finally that its influence has tended to preserve in comparative purity of the types with favours."²⁰

In Risley's analysis the people of India were composed of seven basic racial types: the Mongoloids, the Dravidians, the Indo-Aryans, the Turko-Iranian, the Scytho-Dravidian, the Mongolo-Dravidians & the Aryo-Dravidians. Each group was a result of incursions by different racial types in the subcontinent, the Scythians arriving from central Asia sometime in the Second millennium sweeping down the west coast, the Aryans shortly after. The Mongoloids and the Dravidian races were the original inhabitants of north-eastern India and the Dravidians the original inhabitants of the South, and with these races the invading people sometimes mixed, and sometimes, apparently not. Most of those thought to be tribals, were described by Risley as being of Dravidian or Mongoloid stock, while the agricultural or peasant classes of north India were either of mixed stock or were Aryans in origin. All this Risley believed could be proven by the simple act of measurement, though he admitted that his own evidence, at best, suggested, only a three fold racial division between Aryan, Mongoloid and Dravidian.

As a fortunate coincidence, Risley's conceptions of the Indian castes and races, found a strong support from Dr. George Grierson's Linguistic Survey of India whose conclusions about the linguistic races were similar to that of Risley. According to Dr. Grierson, "after the first swarm of Indo-Aryans had occupied the Punjab, second wave of Aryan speaking people, the remote ancestors of Aryan-Dravidians today, impelled by some ethnic upheaval or driven forward by the change of climate in central Asia made their way into India through Gilgit and Chitral and established themselves in the plains of Ganges and Jumna, the sacred middleland (Madhyadesha) of the vedic tradition. Here they came in the contact of Dravidians, and by stress of that contact caste was evolved. These conclusions of philology are borne out by the physical characters.

The type of people now dwelling in the middle-land is precisely what might have been expected to result from the incursions of a fair, long headed race traveling by a route which prevented women from accompanying them, into a land inhabited by dark-skinned Dravidians. The men of stronger race took to themselves the women of weaker, and from these unions was evolved the mixed type which we find in Hindustan and Bihar. The degree of intermixture varied to the extent indicated in the detailed table of measurement; at one end of the scale the type approaches the Indo-Aryan, at the other it almost merges in the Dravidian.²¹

Armed with these linguistic findings Risley argued that the racial elements in the caste still persisted, because of strict practice of endogamy among the Indian caste groups. Risley outlined seven broader types of castes: tribal castes, functional castes, sectarian castes, castes formed by crossing, national castes, castes formed by migration and the castes formed by custom.

These ideas of Risley provided the main frame of reference in the census of 1901. The classificatory scheme of 1901 envisaged two levels of data collection procedures: first the data collected by the officials based on an exhaustive questionnaire and the second by the physical measurement of the population in the manner prescribed by Risley. The principle followed by the census compilers was one of social precedence, which was derived from Risley's idea that if we put the castes in the order of social precedence and compare them with physical features like colour of skin, length of head and sharpness of nose, both would complement each other, viz. fairer the colour, higher the precedence. Interestingly, the results of the census, particularly in the states of Bombay, Bengal and Madras fully corroborated the conclusions of Risley.

What was outstanding about the census of 1901 that it used castes and races as interchangeable categories, in which both overlapped each other. Caste in India appeared as one static structure, which had no internal mobility. The ideas like upward social mobility of castes, which had a significant place in the census of 1891, did not figure in this census.²²

Despite remaining central to the census of 1901, Risley's theories could not hold ground

for long. The arbitrary imposition of identities on the various groups was widely resented. Not only this newer writings began to question the very theoretical premises of Risley. By the time of the census of 1931 which was in effect, "the last occasion for extensive reporting of caste data"²³ during colonial rule, most of the Risley's theories had been criticised in most persistent and serious of terms. For one, Risley's use of term Dravidian was suggested to be "kept confined to language, and not applied to race".²⁴ In the census of 1931 while to a large extent the racial origin of caste was accepted, however the theory of correspondence between caste and race was summarily rejected, and instead provincial variations were emphasized in the social precedence of castes in different regions. The racial theory of Risley, the census of 1931 held, had a significance only with the north Indian castes, but this correlation was confined within the provinces of Bihar and U.P.²⁵ Beyond it many variations crept in. Given the complexities involved in a more systematic classification of the caste, the census of 1931 broadly followed the occupational basis of caste applied in 1891,²⁶ though this time round the provincial variations were taken a serious account of.

The census of 1931 created a much more sophisticated frame for compiling the census data. This census incorporated the revisions of Stanley Rice²⁷ about the theory of occupational basis of caste, which recognized the customary practices and ceremonial purity of Aryans who took upon the caste - an institution preceding them and adopted it, consciously or unconsciously, and modified it to suit their own ideas. The census report of 1931 also made a departure from the modality of the 1901 census in so far as it tried to incorporate the self-images of the indigenous groups. For example, when during the census survey the Arya Samajists of the Punjab and the Brahmo Samajists of Bengal protested against naming them with any caste group and returned no caste, the report compilers thought of these reactions as one being politically motivated, or at times an attempt by some castes to get upward mobility. However Hutton - the census commissioner, given the flexibility of the caste system explained their no return on caste, as natural on the part of these groups.²⁸

CONCLUSION

What emerges from the above discussions is essentially a more complex picture of the colonial perceptions of the Indian castes and races. Not only there were variety of ideas, rather they were often opposed to each other. Each census report put the earlier ideas to a critical scrutiny and then attempted to devise a more plausible frame of classification. Rather contrary to the ideas of "invention" of castes, the colonial studies were rooted in the data collected by the scholar-officials, albeit more often that not the uniformity of the principles meant a chasm between the self-images of the indigenous groups and that of the colonially imposed. Likewise, despite many instances of arbitrary categorization of the structure of caste, one can see at a later stage a recognition of not only internal mobility of castes, rather in many of these discussions, caste emerged as a dynamic concept, not a "static" or rigidified, as conventionally held. More importantly, these ideas essentially evolved after an interface with the traditional notions of caste. The conventional textual ideas were always given a critical importance in the discourses of the colonial theorists, contesting which they created newer interpretations.

The census reports as arena of what Bernard S. Cohn has termed, "objectification of knowledge", essentially became instruments of colonization through a uniform classification of the subject society. These efforts were directed towards concretizing the power relation of domination-subordination. This is to say, the process of 'knowing' India this way - however 'scientific' or systematic, was not always an end of a scientific pursuit, rather it was deeply rooted in, or became an instrument for enforcing the coloniality of relation between the rulers and ruled.

NOTES

1. This paper is a revised version of a seminar that wrote at the Centre for Historical Studies, JNU, New Delhi under the guidance of Professor Neeladri Bhattacharya, whose in sight into the subject helped me frame some

of the arguments that I have developed here. My thanks are also due to Namrita who was always ready to help me out.

2. Risley, Sir Herbert: *The people of India* p. 5
3. Bayly, Susan. 1996. "Caste and Race in Colonial Ethnography," in Peter Robb (ed.), *The concept of 'Race' in South Asia*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
4. Dirks, Nicholas. 1989. "The Invention of Caste: Civil Society in Colonial India," *Social Analysis*, 25 September,
5. Nandy, Ashish. 1983. *The Intimate Enemy*. Delhi: Oxford University Press.
6. Inden, Ronald. 1990. *Imagining India*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
7. Bayly, *ibid*, Pp.166-67. Bayly gives a vivid description of the current continental scholarship.
8. Bayly, *ibid*.
9. Bayly, *ibid*.
10. Crook, William. 1907. "Races of Northern India," (ed.), Northcote W. Thomas, p. V.
11. Risley, *ibid*. In the chapter "Caste and Nationality", pp. 278-301
Moreover in the census report of 1901 while discussing the element of nationality in the European races Risley explained to be result of a "process of unrestricted crossing" which had "fused a number of distinct tribal types into a more or less definable national type", this process of fusion in India according to him had ceased to operate long ago. Thus Risley concluded, "there is consequently no national type and no nation in the ordinary sense of the term" Census of 1901, General Report, vol. Part I, Pp. 496.
12. Report by the officer appointed to consider the suggestion for a general census in India under the chairmanship of W.C.Plowdin in 1881, pp.18-20
13. *ibid*. Pp.58-59. Letter dated India Office, the March 4th 1881, London.
14. Census of India for 1891. Vol.I, Part I, General report,pp.181-187
15. *ibid*. Pg.184
16. *ibid*. Pg. 183
17. Ibbeston, D.C. J. : Report on the census of the Punjab, 1881, Vol. I, Calcutta, 1883
18. Census of 1891. In the column 4 the classificatory scheme contained

Religion,	Caste or Race
2. Main religion	4. Main caste, tribe or class
3. Sect of religion	5. Sub-division of caste, tribe & class

This table was followed by specific instruction

- for column 4 for entering caste if Hindu or Jain and the tribes of those who have no castes and races of Christians, Buddhists &c.
19. Bates, Crispin. 1996. "Race, Caste and Tribe in Central India," in the Peter Robb (ed.), *The Concept of Race in South Asia*. Delhi: OUP.
 20. Risley. 1901. *Census of India*. *ibid.* Pp. 489.
 21. Grierson, George. *Linguistic Survey of India*, Introduction
Risley discusses the findings of Grierson at length.
 22. The census of 1891 General Report wrote, "in spite of theoretically immutable barriers of caste, it is plain that the community which acknowledges them is constantly leaping over or creeping under them, or adding to their number, but in all this change steadily adhering to the main and vital principles of the institutions."
 23. Coulon, Frank F. "The Census of India as Source," in N. Gerald Barrier (ed.), *The census of British India*.
 24. *Census of India, 1931*, Vol.V, Bengal and Sikkim, Part I, p. 436
 25. *ibid.* p. 439
 26. *ibid.* p. 433
 27. Rice, Stanley. 1931. *The Origin of Caste*, in *The Asiatic Review*, pp. 147-331.
Quoted from the *Census of India*. Vol.V, p. 439
 28. *Census of India*, Vol. II, p. 430